



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,613	12/21/2001	Peter Worthington Hamilton	5922R2CC	4354

27752 7590 08/04/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/027,613	HAMILTON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Victor S Chang	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \*   c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's amendments and remarks filed on 6/20/2003. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 5 and 7 have been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Rejections not maintained are withdrawn.

### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on 6/20/2003 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Pat. No. 6,194,062 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

### ***Double Patenting***

5. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12, 14-18, 41-52, 54-58, 66, 81, 87-88 and 95-111 of copending Application No. 09/715586. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

For claims 1-4 and 7-9, the independent claims 41, 95 and dependent claims 53, 66, 101 and 109 of the copending Application No. 09/715586 shows all the features of

Art Unit: 1771

the instantly claimed invention, except the density of the protrusions. However, it is believed that a suitable density is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill in the art, motivated by the desire to provide adequate prevention of premature adhesion before the activation of the adhesive by pressure, and sufficient adhesion after activation.

For claims 5 and 6, although independent claims 38 and 86 of the copending Application No. 09/716740 do not expressly claim the plurality of protrusion having an amorphous or regular pattern, the Examiner repeats (see Paper No. 3, page 5) that arranging the protrusion, so as to apply adhesive in suitable geometric arrangement, is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization of adhesive properties to one of ordinary skill of the art. Note also as evidence the state of the art Leander (US 2510120), which teaches that laying various shapes and forms of adhesive strips on a substrate at suitable locations is well within the ordinary skill in the art (Figs. 1 and 2).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

6. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18, 38-55, 75, 80-81 and 86-102 of copending Application No. 09/716740. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

For claims 1-4 and 7-9, independent claims 38 and 86 and dependent claims 13 and 50 of the copending Application No. 09/716740 shows all the features of the instantly claimed invention, except the density of the protrusions. However, it is

Art Unit: 1771

believed that a suitable density is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill in the art, motivated by the desire to provide adequate prevention of premature adhesion before the activation of the adhesive by pressure, and sufficient adhesion after activation.

For claims 5 and 6, although independent claims 38 and 86 of the copending Application No. 09/716740 do not expressly claim the plurality of protrusion having an amorphous or regular pattern, the Examiner repeats that arranging the protrusion, so as to apply adhesive in suitable geometric arrangement, is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization of adhesive properties to one of ordinary skill of the art, as set forth above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilbur (US 2338749) in view of the admitted prior art.

Wilbur's invention relates to wrappers of flexible paper or other equivalent sheet material (column 1, lines 1-3). Wilbur teaches that the invention can be embodied in a label, wrapper, envelope or other article of flexible sheet material intended for other

Art Unit: 1771

uses (page 1, column 2, lines 34-37). Figs. 1 and 2 show that a permanently sticky or tacky adhesive 11 is coated in the pockets or recesses of an embossed web of sheet material (page 1, column 2, line 13, and page 1, column 2, line 53 to page 2, column 1, line 1). The ribs or elevations 12 and 13 serve to shield the adhesive coatings of the recesses or pockets against accidental contact with other objects (page 2, column 1, lines 6-15). The bonding is carried by pressing or crushing by finger pressure (page 2, column 1, lines 31-32).

For claims 1-4 and 7, it is noted that Wilbur lacks express teaching that the flexible sheet material is a storage wrap film with small resiliency (i.e., being conformable). However, it is noted that Applicant admitted that it is known art that sheet materials with clinging character (i.e., cling film) can be used to form a closure for a container (Specification, page 1, lines 18-26). Further, it is believed that a suitable small resiliency (i.e., being conformable) of the cling film are either inherently disclosed or an obvious optimization to one skilled in the art, motivated by the desire to reduce the material cost and to obtain a good wrapping (or conforming) property to preserve the sealed materials. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a cling film with Wilbur's teaching to form a clingless film with adhesive in the recess of an embossed film, motivated by the desire to prevent premature adhesion or cling (i.e., clingless) to an object, such as a container. As to the density of the protrusions, it is believed that a suitable density is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill in the art, motivated by the desire to provide

Art Unit: 1771

adequate prevention of premature adhesion before the activation of the adhesive by pressure, and sufficient adhesion after activation.

For claims 5 and 6, the Examiner repeats that arranging the protrusion, so as to apply adhesive in suitable geometric arrangement, is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization of adhesive properties to one of ordinary skill of the art, as set forth above.

For claim 8, it is believed that a suitable amount of pressure to activate the adhesion and peel force after activation are believed to be either inherently disclosed or an obvious optimization to one skilled in the art, motivated by the desire to obtain a good bonding, as set forth above.

For claim 9, Wilbur clearly discloses in Fig. 2 that the adhesive partially fills the recess between the protrusions.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S Chang whose telephone number is 703-605-4296. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 10/027,613

Page 7

Art Unit: 1771

VSC

July 28, 2003

DANIEL ZIRKER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300

1700

*Daniel Zinker*